

## **REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the first Office Action dated April 23, 2003. Claims 1-35 are in the application. Claims 8, 17, and 24 have been amended to correct informalities. Claims 29-35 have been added. No claims have been canceled.

The specification has been amended on page 10 to correct a grammatical error and to provide updated reference information for the co-pending patent application on packing a web archive file.

Regarding the drawings, formal drawings are now enclosed.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 8, 17, and 24 were objected to because of the following informality: At the end of the limitation “<img dynsrc=>”, there is a missing semicolon. These informalities have been corrected, and a second informality --<bgsound src>'-- in claim 8 have been corrected to read --<bgsound src>;--.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16-20, 22-24, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mantha et al. (USPN 6,163,779).

The Mantha reference teaches a technique for storing a web page, its image files in a link list file, and its URL links in a second link list file all in a category folder in local client storage. Having stored these files in the category folder, the Mantha reference describes opening a directory of the category folder, selecting all the related files for a web page and attaching all the selected files to an email (see column 13, lines 44-48).

The present invention, however, is directed to attaching a web page and its resource files to an email by detecting an attachment event, determining the attachment is a web page with links to other resources and packing the web page plus its resource files in a single attachment file. This single attachment file is then attached to the email (see above-identified application at page 12, line 9, to page 13, line 8).

With these differences between the present invention and the Mantha reference in mind, the manner in which these differences are reflected in the claims will now be reviewed. In independent claims 1 and 10 the last steps of the method are packing of a web page file and at least one resource file into a single attachment file, and attaching that single attachment file to the email.

The examiner cites column 13, lines 33-48, as describing this function. However, as discussed above the Mantha reference only describes opening a directory and attaching a plurality of files from that directory into the email note. There is no packing of a single attachment file containing the web page file and its resource files.

Further, in claims 1 and 10 the steps leading up to packing the attachment file are conditional responsive operations. The packing only occurs in response to the determination that the selected file has at least one link to a resource file and to the determination that the selected file is a web page. Thus the packing and attaching operations form a combination with the above determining operations that is a novel combination in both claims 1 and 10.

In addition, in claim 10 another determination in the combination of determinations is a determination that the attachment of the resource file is authorized. The Mantha reference does not make this determination. It is only in the present invention that there is a control or authorization indicating whether the web page is to be transmitted with or without the resource files. Accordingly, claims 1 and 10 are novel and patentable over the Mantha reference and should be allowed.

Claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 depend from claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as just discussed above for claim 1.

Claims 12, 13, and 16-20 depend from claim 10 and should be allowed for the same reasons as discussed above for claim 10.

Independent claim 22 is directed to a system for automatically attaching a web page as a single file to an email note. The system has a web page packing object that packs the web page and at least one resource file into a single web archive file. As discussed above for claims 1 and 10, the Mantha reference does not teach packing a web page and a resource file into a single file or, in this particular case, a single web archive file. Further, claim 22 indicates that the email client detects the attachment of a web page and automatically triggers the web page packing into the single web archive file. The Mantha reference does not automatically trigger web page packing. Accordingly, claim 22 is novel and patentable and should be allowed.

Claims 23, 24, 27 and 28 all depend from claim 22 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 22.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2, 11, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha in view of Borman et al. (USPN 6,226,655). Claim 2 depends on claim 1. The Borman reference does not fill any of the deficiencies discussed above regarding the Mantha reference relative to claim 1. Therefore, claim 2 should be allowed for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1. Likewise, claim 11 depends on claim 10 and for the same reasons as discussed for claim 10 should be allowed. Finally, claim 26 depends on claim 22 and should be allowed for the same reasons as discussed for claim 22.

Claims 5, 6, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha in view of Gupta et al. (USPN 6,519,646). Claims 5 and 6 depend on claim 1. The Gupta reference does not satisfy any of the deficiencies of the Mantha reference as discussed above for claim 1. Therefore, claims 5 and 6 should be allowed. Similarly, claims 14 and 15 depend on claim 10, and the Gupta reference does not disclose elements of claim 10 that are missing from the Mantha reference. Accordingly, claims 14 and 15 should be allowed for the same reasons that claim 10 is allowed.

Claims 9, 21, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha in view of Gabbard et al. (USPN 6,205,432). Claims 9, 21, and 25 add to claims 1, 10, and 22, respectively, the format of the attachment file as being an MHTML file. The Gabbard reference does teach MIME format to permit data, video, sound and binary files to be transmitted by Internet email (column 1, lines 52-56). Gabbard does not teach packing a web page and all of its resource files into a single attachment file. The examiner cited large portions of the Gabbard reference as describing packing a web page file and its reference files into a single file. Applicants' attorney has been unable to find such a description. If the examiner will cite the specific few lines where Gabbard teaches packing a web page file and resource file into a single file, applicants' attorney will respond. The Gabbard patent does not provide any of the missing elements in the Mantha reference relative to claims 1, 10 and 22 as discussed above. Claims 9, 21, and 25 depend on claims 1, 10, and 22, and, therefore, should be allowed for the same reasons as discussed above for claims 1, 10, and 22.

### **New Claims**

New method claims 29-35 are also novel and patentable over the Mantha reference, the Borman reference, the Gupta reference and the Gabbard reference. In claim 29, the act of

packing the selected file and one or more resource files into a single attachment file is in response to a determination that the selected file includes one or more links to resource files. None of the references describe packing into a single attachment file in response to a determination that the selected file includes one or more links. Claim 29 should be allowed. Claims 30-35 depend from claim 29 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 29.

**Conclusion**

As all claims now in the application are in condition for allowance, Applicants request the application be allowed and pass to issuance as soon as possible.


A check in the amount of \$210, for the one additional independent claim exceeding 3 independent claims, and the seven additional claims exceeding 28 total claims (previously paid for) is submitted herewith. It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Merchant & Gould, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
303.357.1633

Date: July 23, 2003.

CUSTOMER NO. 27488



Homer L. Knearl  
Reg. No. 21,197